

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Appeal Brief filed June 3, 2008 has been carefully considered by an Appeal Conference. The conferees agreed that the combination of teaching between Meadow and Rieger fails to teach the claimed trusted computing platform, since Rieger merely teaching trusted platform as recited in the claimed invention. Thus the office action mailed January 24, 2008 is now withdrawn. The office regrets any inconvenience due to the applicant. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Anderson (US 6,115,819). Claims 11-19 are pending. At this time claims 11-19 are still rejected.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election with traverse of **Species 2** in the reply filed on May 17, 2007 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-10 are withdrawn by the applicant from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species 2 and species 3. Election was made with traverse in the reply filed on May 17, 2007. This is not found persuasive because each of the various disclosed species details a mutual exclusive characteristic of:

Species 1 is drawn to "An information system comprising an information access point relating to at least one pre-determined geographical area, said information access point including apparatus for retrieving information relating to computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area, together with security attributes of said computing platforms, said information system being arranged to provide said information to a user upon request."

Species 2 is drawn to "An information system comprising an information access point relating to at least one pre-determined geographical area, said information access point including apparatus for retrieving information relating to trusted computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area, said information system being arranged to provide said information to a user upon request."

These above individual species act as evidenced by the representation of each various species with a different figure or set of figures.

A search for one of these mutually exclusive characteristics is not coextensive with a search for the other mutually exclusive characteristics and therefore searching for all mutually exclusive characteristics could not be done without serious burden. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meadows et al (US 6,716,101 B1), and further in view of Anderson (US 6,115,819).

a. *Referring to claim 11:*

i. Meadows teaches an information system comprising:

(1) an information access point relating to at least one pre-determined geographical area, said information access point including apparatus for retrieving information relating to trusted computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area, said information system being arranged to provide said information to a user upon request (**column 2, lines 3-28 and column 5, lines 13-29 of Meadows**).

ii. Although Meadow teaches an information system using access point with related pre-determined geographical area for network communication via authorized user/client, Meadow is silent on the capability of communicating with trusted computing platform. On the other hand, Anderson teaches this limitation in **column 5, line 54 through column 6, line 2 of Anderson**.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the invention of Meadow with the teaching of Rieger for monitoring geographical location and movement **(column 1, line 11 of Meadow)**.

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the invention of Meadow with the teaching of Rieger for providing the location information to an authorized user through the world wide web **(column 2, lines 4-6 of Meadow)**.

b. Referring to claim 12:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Anderson teaches the claimed subject matter. Meadows further teaches:

(1) wherein said information system is arranged to provide as said information only details and/or a list of public keys (e.g., access codes) of genuine trusted computing platforms within said pre-determined geographical area **(column 5, lines 13-29 of Meadows)**.

c. Referring to claim 13:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Anderson teaches the claimed subject matter. Rieger further teaches:

(1) wherein said information access point comprises a trusted computing platform **(column 5, line 54 through column 6, line 2 of Anderson)**.

d. Referring to claim 14:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Anderson teaches the claimed subject matter. Meadow further teaches:

(1) comprising apparatus for communicating or interacting with a user's portable computing apparatus **(column 5, lines 30-47 of Meadows)**.

e. Referring to claim 15:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Anderson teaches the claimed subject matter. Meadows further teaches:

(1) wherein said apparatus for communicating or interacting a user's portable computing apparatus is arranged to perform said communication or interaction by physical contact or directional wireless communication **(column 5, lines 30-47 of Meadows).**

f. Referring to claims 16-17:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Anderson teaches the claimed subject matter. Meadows further teaches:

(1) incorporating or accompanied by a declaration concerning the trustworthiness of the system; wherein said declaration is capable of interpretation by a user without preprocessing by an information processing system **[i.e., Figures 4 and 5 shows the graphical user interface for monitoring system for monitoring the four adolescent children and the three individuals (column 5, lines 48-67 and column 6, lines 1-36 of Meadows)].**

g. Referring to claim 18:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Anderson teaches the claimed subject matter. Rieger further teaches:

(1) arranged to verify the identity of a user **(column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 16 of Rieger).**

h. Referring to claim 19:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 15, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 15 above.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

Art Unit: 2135

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

/Thanhnga B. Truong/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2135

TBT

September 15, 2008